

1 J. MICHAEL KALER, SBN 158296  
2 KALER LAW OFFICES  
3 9930 Mesa Rim Road, Suite 200  
4 San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone (858) 362-3151

5 MELODY A. KRAMER, SBN 169984  
6 KRAMER LAW OFFICE, INC.  
7 9930 Mesa Rim Road, Suite 1600  
8 San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone (858) 362-3150

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff JENS ERIK SORENSEN,  
as Trustee of SORENSEN RESEARCH AND  
10 DEVELOPMENT TRUST

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
12 FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13 JENS ERIK SORENSEN, as Trustee of ) Case No. 07-CV-02278-BTM-CAB  
14 SORENSEN RESEARCH AND )  
15 DEVELOPMENT TRUST, )  
16 Plaintiff, )  
17 v. )  
18 HELEN OF TROY Texas Corporation; )  
19 OXO International Ltd.; and DOES 1- )  
100, )  
20 Defendants. )  
21 )  
22 )  
23 )  
24 )  
25 )  
26 )  
27 )  
28 )  
Case No. 07-CV-02278-BTM-CAB )  
DEclaration of Melody A. Kramer in Support of Plaintiff's Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Motion for Exception to Stay to Preserve Evidence )  
Date: October 31, 2008 )  
Time: 11:00 a.m. )  
Courtroom 15 – 5<sup>th</sup> Floor )  
The Hon. Barry T. Moskowitz )  
NO ORAL ARGUMENTS UNLESS REQUESTED BY COURT )  
})

1 I, MELODY A. KRAMER, declare:

2 1. I am not a party to the present action. I am over the age of eighteen. I  
3 have personal knowledge of the facts contained within the following paragraphs, and  
4 could and would competently testify thereto if called as a witness in a court of law.

5 2. At all times relevant herein I have been an attorney for Sorensen  
6 Research and Development Trust (“SRDT”), Plaintiff in the above-captioned matter.

7 3. This Declaration is being submitted in conjunction with **PLAINTIFF’S**  
8 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF**  
9 **MOTION FOR EXCEPTION TO STAY TO PRESERVE EVIDENCE**

10 4. Plaintiff has already requested the relief sought in this motion from  
11 Defendants by stipulation, and has provided Defendant with a copy of relevant  
12 portions of the August 20, 2008 court transcript and resulting orders in those six  
13 related cases in which the Court ordered identical discovery. However, Defendant  
14 still refuses to stipulate.

15 5. Pre-litigation, Defendants’ counsel advised Plaintiff’s counsel that  
16 detailed manufacturing information required to respond to Plaintiff’s infringement  
17 claims had to be obtained “from OXO’s suppliers in Asia.”

18 6. In a letter dated October 31, 2005, counsel for Defendants  
19 acknowledged the difficulty in getting process information from the foreign third  
20 party manufacturers. Additionally a number of the Accused Products are near the  
21 end of their life cycle, as stated by Defendants’ counsel in a letter dated March 16,  
22 2006.

23 7. These facts lead Plaintiff to believe that the Accused Products have  
24 ceased to be in production or will no longer be in production soon. As a result, the  
25 foreign manufacturer is not likely to, and has no obligation to maintain molds, design  
26 documents or correspondence. Every day that goes by without the production of this  
27 evidence increases the likelihood that the evidence will be lost or destroyed.

1       8. Defendant has not provided Plaintiff with identification of the  
2 manufacturers, importers, suppliers, or other non-parties who may have possession,  
3 custody, or control of relevant evidence to this case, specifically including prototype  
4 and production molds and technical documents requested in the motion, thus there  
5 is no way to ensure preservation of evidence.

6  
7  
8 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this Thursday, September 11, 2008.

9  
10                   JENS ERIK SORENSEN, as Trustee of  
11                   SORENSEN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT  
12                   TRUST, Plaintiff

13                   /s/ Melody A. Kramer

14                   

---

15                   Melody A. Kramer, Esq.  
16                   Attorney for Plaintiff

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28